

Once more on mixing of the $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ mesons

N.N. Achasov* and A.V. Kiselev†

Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Sobolev Institute for Mathematics, Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

We show that a recent proposal by Close and Kirk fails to describe $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ mixing when physical masses and widths are included.

PACS number(s): 12.39.-x, 13.40.Hq, 13.65.+i

Typeset using REVTeX

*achasov@math.nsc.ru

†kiselev@math.nsc.ru

The mixing of the $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ mesons was discovered theoretically as the threshold phenomenon in Ref. [1]. In Ref. [2] a number of experiments were proposed. There is also some additional information in Ref. [3]. Recently the interest in the $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ mixing was renewed [4–10].

In Refs. [1–4] is shown that the $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ mixing effects can be rather essential if a production amplitude of the resonance with isotopic spin $I = 1$ (or $I = 0$) is considerably more than a production amplitude of the resonance with $I = 0$ (or $I = 1$). For example, if the module of a production amplitude of the resonance with $I = 1$ (or $I = 0$) is three times large as the module of a production amplitude of the resonance with $I = 0$ (or $I = 1$) the mixing effect can reach 10%-20%.

So, the conclusion of Ref. [8], that in the $K\bar{K}$ molecule model of the $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ mesons the mixing effect can be as great as one likes even for equal production amplitudes of the resonances with $I = 0$ and $I = 1$, is unexpected. Unfortunately, this conclusion is not correct as we show below.

In Ref. [8] the authors consider the molecule states

$$\begin{aligned} |f_0\rangle &= \cos\theta |K^+K^-\rangle + \sin\theta |K^0\bar{K}^0\rangle, \\ |a_0^0\rangle &= \sin\theta |K^+K^-\rangle - \cos\theta |K^0\bar{K}^0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

i.e., mixing of the states with the isotopical spin $I = 1$ and 0

$$\begin{aligned} |f_0\rangle &= \cos\vartheta |f_0(I=0)\rangle + \sin\vartheta |a_0^0(I=1)\rangle, \\ |a_0^0\rangle &= \cos\vartheta |a_0^0(I=1)\rangle - \sin\vartheta |f_0(I=0)\rangle \\ &\text{and the inverse equations} \\ |f_0(I=0)\rangle &= \cos\vartheta |f_0\rangle - \sin\vartheta |a_0^0\rangle, \\ |a_0^0(I=1)\rangle &= \cos\vartheta |a_0^0\rangle + \sin\vartheta |f_0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $|a_0^0(I=1)\rangle = (K^+K^- - K^0\bar{K}^0)/\sqrt{2}$, $|f_0(I=0)\rangle = (K^+K^- + K^0\bar{K}^0)/\sqrt{2}$, $\vartheta = \pi/4 - \theta$, $\theta = 30^\circ$.

Suggesting that $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma a_0$ and $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma f_0$, they find

$$BR(\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma f_0)/BR(\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma a_0) = \cos^2\theta/\sin^2\theta. \quad (3)$$

In the case that the resonances overlap each other, in our case, it is the fallacy. The point is that mixing the states with the isotopical spin $I = 1$ and 0 leads to the advent of the forbidden decays $f_0^0 \rightarrow \pi\eta$ and $a_0^0 \rightarrow \pi\pi$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(a_0^0 \rightarrow \pi\eta) &= g \cos\vartheta, & g(f_0^0 \rightarrow \pi\eta) &= g \sin\vartheta, \\ g(f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi) &= h \cos\vartheta, & g(a_0^0 \rightarrow \pi\pi) &= -h \sin\vartheta, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

which lead to interference between the $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances in the $\pi\eta$ and $\pi\pi$ spectra mass, which compensates mixing influence on the $\phi \rightarrow \gamma a_0$ and $\phi \rightarrow \gamma f_0$ amplitudes practically completely.

Indeed, the $\phi \rightarrow \gamma(a_0 + f_0) \rightarrow \gamma\pi\eta$ and $\phi \rightarrow \gamma(f_0 + a_0) \rightarrow \gamma\pi\pi$ amplitudes are of the forms

$$\begin{aligned} A[\phi \rightarrow \gamma(a_0 + f_0) \rightarrow \gamma\pi\eta] &\propto \left(\frac{\sin\theta \cos\vartheta}{D_{a_0}(m)} + \frac{\cos\theta \sin\vartheta}{D_{f_0}(m)} \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{D_{a_0}(m)} + \cos\theta \sin\vartheta \sqrt{2} \left[\frac{1}{D_{f_0}(m)} - \frac{1}{D_{a_0}(m)} \right] \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{D_{a_0}(m)} \left(1 + \cos\theta \sin\vartheta \sqrt{2} [D_{a_0}(m) - D_{f_0}(m)] / D_{f_0}(m) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A[\phi \rightarrow \gamma(f_0 + a_0) \rightarrow \gamma\pi\pi] &\propto \left(\frac{\cos\theta \cos\vartheta}{D_{f_0}(m)} - \frac{\sin\theta \sin\vartheta}{D_{a_0}(m)} \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{D_{f_0}(m)} + \sin\theta \sin\vartheta \sqrt{2} \left[\frac{1}{D_{f_0}(m)} - \frac{1}{D_{a_0}(m)} \right] \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{D_{f_0}(m)} \left(1 + \sin\theta \sin\vartheta \sqrt{2} [D_{a_0}(m) - D_{f_0}(m)] / D_{a_0}(m) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $D_R(m) = m_R^2 - m^2 - im\Gamma_R(m)$ is the propagator of the R resonance, $R = a_0$ or f_0 , m is the invariant mass of the $\pi\eta$ or $\pi\pi$ systems.

So, when $D_{f_0}(m) = D_{a_0}(m)$, mixing effect is absent at all!

The model of Ref. [8] assumes that $D_{f_0}(m)$ is very close to $D_{a_0}(m)$. But let us consider some figures. The natural estimation of the mass difference is $m_{a_0} - m_{f_0} = \cos 2\theta (2m_{K^0} - 2m_{K^+}) = 4$ MeV. As for the difference of the widths, $\Gamma_{a_0}(m_{a_0}) - \Gamma_{f_0}(m_{f_0}) = \pm 10$ MeV is the conservative estimation. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \cos\theta \sin\vartheta \sqrt{2} [D_{a_0}(m) - D_{f_0}(m)] / D_{f_0}(m) \right| &< 0.08, \\ \left| \sin\theta \sin\vartheta \sqrt{2} [D_{a_0}(m) - D_{f_0}(m)] / D_{a_0}(m) \right| &< 0.05. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

When calculating the right sides in the equations of (7), we use $m = m_{f_0}$, $\Gamma_{f_0}(m_{f_0}) = 50$ MeV in the denominator of the first equation and $m = m_{a_0}$, $\Gamma_{a_0}(m_{a_0}) = 50$ MeV in the denominator of the second equation.

So, the considerable mixing effect on the branching ratios is out of the question. Nevertheless, let us consider the effect in more detail. The branching ratios are the integrals of the spectra $S_{a_0}(m)$ and $S_{f_0}(m)$ over m [11]:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{a_0}(m) &= dBR[\phi \rightarrow \gamma(a_0 + f_0) \rightarrow \gamma\pi\eta, m] / dm = \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{m^2 \Gamma(\phi \rightarrow \gamma a_0, m) \Gamma(a_0 \rightarrow \pi\eta, m)}{\Gamma_\phi |D_{a_0}(m)|^2} \left| 1 + \cos\theta \sin\vartheta \sqrt{2} [D_{a_0}(m) - D_{f_0}(m)] / D_{f_0}(m) \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_{f_0}(m) &= dBR[\phi \rightarrow \gamma(f_0 + a_0) \rightarrow \gamma\pi\pi, m] / dm = \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{m^2 \Gamma(\phi \rightarrow \gamma f_0, m) \Gamma(f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi, m)}{\Gamma_\phi |D_{f_0}(m)|^2} \left| 1 + \sin\theta \sin\vartheta \sqrt{2} [D_{a_0}(m) - D_{f_0}(m)] / D_{a_0}(m) \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Removing the module squares in Eqs. (8) and (9) it is easy to verify that the mixing corrections have the same sign in Eqs. (8) and (9), i.e., the additional considerable compensation of the mixing effects takes place in $S_{a_0}(m)/S_{f_0}(m)$. Using the estimations (7), one can see that the mixing effect correction in $S_{a_0}(m)/S_{f_0}(m)$ is less than 0.1, which is to say that the mixing effect correction in $BR[\phi \rightarrow \gamma(a_0 + f_0) \rightarrow \gamma\pi\eta]/BR[\phi \rightarrow \gamma(a_0 + f_0) \rightarrow \gamma\pi\pi]$ is undoubted less than 10%, i.e., less than the correction due to the difference of the volumes of the $\pi\eta$ and $\pi\pi$ phase spaces.

Note that there is no tragedy with the relation between branching ratios of a_0 and f_0 production in the ϕ radiative decays.

The early predictions [11] are based on the one-loop mechanism $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma a_0 \rightarrow \gamma\pi\eta$ and $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma f_0 \rightarrow \gamma\pi\pi$ at $m_{a_0} = 980$ MeV, $m_{f_0} = 975$ MeV and $g_{a_0K^+K^-} = g_{f_0K^+K^-}$, that leads to $BR(\phi \rightarrow \gamma a_0 \rightarrow \gamma\pi\eta) \approx BR(\phi \rightarrow \gamma f_0 \rightarrow \gamma\pi\pi)$.

But it is shown in Ref. [12] that the relation between branching ratios of a_0 and f_0 production in the ϕ radiative decays depends essentially on a $a_0 - f_0$ mass splitting at $g_{a_0K^+K^-} = g_{f_0K^+K^-}$. This strong mass dependence is the result of gauge invariance, the (photon energy)³ law on the right slope of the resonance.

Both SND and CMD detectors use the one-loop model $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma a_0$ and $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma f_0$ in the data treatment. SND gives $m_{a_0} = 994^{+33}_{-8}$ MeV [13](2000), $m_{f_0} = 0.9698 \pm 0.0045$ MeV [14](2000), CMD gives $m_{f_0} = 0.969 \pm 0.005$ MeV [15].

Regarding the coupling constants, SND gives $g_{a_0K^+K^-}^2/4\pi = 1.05 \pm 0.36^{+0.36}_{-0.25}$ [13](2000) GeV² and $g_{f_0K^+K^-}^2/4\pi = 2.47 \pm 0.73^{+0.73}_{-0.51}$ GeV² [14](2000). CMD gives $g_{f_0K^+K^-}^2/4\pi = 1.49 \pm 0.36$ GeV² [15].

So, there is no drastic difference between $g_{f_0K^+K^-}$ and $g_{a_0K^+K^-}$.

As for the KLOE data, a detailed analysis is not presented up to now [16].

The Ref. [8] analysis of the ratio of production rates in the central region at high energy by Pomeron - Pomeron collision = PP (isoscalar)

$$\sigma(PP \rightarrow a_0)/\sigma(PP \rightarrow f_0) = \frac{1 - \sin 2\theta}{1 + \sin 2\theta} = \frac{\sin^2 \vartheta}{\cos^2 \vartheta} \quad (10)$$

is not correct also.

As well as in the above example, proper allowance must be made for interference between the $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances in the $\pi\eta$ and $\pi\pi$ mass spectra.

The $PP \rightarrow a_0 + f_0 \rightarrow \pi\eta$ and $PP \rightarrow f_0 + a_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitudes are of the forms

$$A[PP \rightarrow a_0 + f_0 \rightarrow \pi\eta] \propto \left(-\frac{\sin \vartheta \cos \vartheta}{D_{a_0}(m)} + \frac{\cos \vartheta \sin \vartheta}{D_{f_0}(m)} \right) = \sin \vartheta \cos \vartheta \frac{D_{a_0}(m) - D_{f_0}(m)}{D_{a_0}(m)D_{f_0}(m)} \quad (11)$$

and

$$A[PP \rightarrow f_0 + a_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi] \propto \left(\frac{\cos^2 \vartheta}{D_{f_0}(m)} + \frac{\sin^2 \vartheta}{D_{a_0}(m)} \right) = \frac{1}{D_{f_0}(m)} \left(1 - \sin^2 \vartheta [D_{a_0}(m) - D_{f_0}(m)] / D_{a_0}(m) \right). \quad (12)$$

Estimating as in the above example we get

$$\sigma(PP \rightarrow a_0)/\sigma(PP \rightarrow f_0) < 4 \times 10^{-3}. \quad (13)$$

Note that the experimental value, found in Ref. [6],

$$\sigma(PP \rightarrow a_0)/\sigma(PP \rightarrow f_0) = (8 \pm 3) \times 10^{-2} \quad (14)$$

differs from the prediction of Ref. [2] ¹

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(PP \rightarrow f_0 \rightarrow a_0 \rightarrow \pi\eta)/\sigma(PP \rightarrow f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi) &\approx BR(f_0 \rightarrow \pi\eta)/BR(f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi) = \\ \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{m_\pi+m_\eta}^{m_{max}} \left| \frac{mM_{f_0a_0}(m)}{D_{a_0}(m)D_{f_0}(m) - m^2M_{f_0a_0}^2(m)} \right|^2 m^2 \Gamma(a_0 \rightarrow \pi\eta, m) dm / BR(f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi) &= \\ (0.5 - 2) \times 10^{-2} / BR(f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi) &\approx (1.25 - 1.43)(0.5 - 2) \times 10^{-2} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

by 1.71 - 2.46 experimental errors. It is appropriate at this point to recall that the data on $PP \rightarrow f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ is indirect. They are obtained in fitting a very complicated spectrum with the help of the $f_0(980)$, $f_0(1300)$, $f_0(1500)$ resonances and a coherent background [17].

Emphasize that in the case of overlapping resonances, the parameter of mixing is $M_{RR'}(m_R)/\Gamma_R(m_R)$ and not $mM_{RR'}(m)/[D_{f_0}(m) - D_{a_0}(m)]$, where $mM_{RR'}(m)$ is the non-diagonal element of the polarization operator describing the $R - R'$ transition. In our case, in the case of the isospin breaking transition, the very conservative estimation is $|M_{f_0a_0}(m_{f_0})/\Gamma_{f_0}(m_{f_0})| \lesssim 0.1$.

Note also that in the Close and Kirk model $mM_{RR'}(m) = \sin \vartheta \cos \vartheta (D_{f_0}(m) - D_{a_0}(m))$.

We thank very much J. Schechter, G.N. Shestakov and S.F. Tuan for discussions.

This work was supported in part by RFBR, Grant No 02-02-16061.

¹Note that this prediction is due to the strong coupling of the $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ mesons with the $K\bar{K}$ channel.

REFERENCES

- [1] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin and G.N. Shestakov, Phys. Lett. **88B** (1979) 367.
- [2] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin and G.N. Shestakov, Yad. Fiz. **33** (1981) 1337 [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **33** (1981) 715].
- [3] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin and G.N. Shestakov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **142** (1984) 361 [Sov. Phys. Usp. **27** (1984) 161].
- [4] N.N. Achasov and G.N. Shestakov, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 212.
- [5] B. Kerbikov and F. Tabakin, Phys. Rev. C **62** (2000) 064601.
- [6] F.E. Close and A. Kirk, Phys. Lett. B **489** (2000) 13.
- [7] A.E. Kudryavtsev and V.E. Tarasov, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **72** (2000) 58 [JETP Lett. **72** (2000) 410].
- [8] F.E. Close and A. Kirk, Phys. Lett. B **515** (2001) 13.
- [9] V.Yu. Grishina, L.A. Kondratyuk, M. Büscher, W Gassing and H. Ströher, Phys. Lett. B **521** (2001) 217.
- [10] D. Black, M Harada, and J. Schechter, hep-ph/0202069.
- [11] N.N. Achasov and V.N. Ivanchenko, Nucl. Phys. B **315** (1989) 465 .
- [12] N.N. Achasov and V.V. Gubin, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 4084 (1997).
- [13] M.N. Achasov et al., Phys. Lett. B **438**, 441 (1998); **479**, 53 (2000).
- [14] M.N. Achasov et al., Phys. Lett. B **440**, (1998) 442 ; **485** (2000) 349.
- [15] R.R. Akhmetshin et al., Phys. Lett. B **462** (1999) 380.
- [16] A. Aloisio, Contributed paper to Lepton 2001, Rome, July 23-28; hep-ex/0107024.
- [17] D. Barberis et al., Phys. Lett. B **453** (1999) 325.